

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments is courteously solicited.

With reference to paragraph 1 of the examiner's office action, Applicant submitted on August 26, 2003 a statement in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.125. Acknowledgement of receipt of the statement in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.125 is requested. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicant attaches hereto a copy of the aforesaid communication.

With reference to the drawing objections and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as set forth in paragraphs 2-6 of the Examiner's action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the foregoing objections and rejection for the reasons set forth herein. Pages 22, 25 and 26 of the instant application have been amended so as to correct inadvertent typographical error which occurred in the originally drafted specification. The amendments to the specification remove the inconsistencies raised by the typographical errors in that, as amended, "M1" designates "small regions" throughout the specification and "S1" designates "combat elements" throughout the specification. In addition, the specification has been amended on Page 27 starting on line 23 through Page 29 ending on line 11 by deleting this portion of the specification which refers to Figures 9 and 10, which figures are not included as part of the instant application nor were they included as part of the original Japanese priority application. In light of the foregoing amendments, it is submitted that the objections and rejection set forth in paragraphs 3-6 of the examiner's office action should now be withdrawn.

The Examiner's objection raised in paragraph 7 of his office action is rendered moot by the cancellation of Page 28 of the instant specification.

The Examiner's objection to claim 5 has been rendered moot by the amendment made to claim 5 as set forth above.

In response to the examiner's rejection set forth in paragraph 9 of the office action, claims 8 and 9 have been deleted.

The examiner rejected previously submitted claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,952,922 in view of U.S. patent 5,880,709. It is respectfully submitted, for the reasons set forth hereinbelow, that the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 specifically sets forth the following:

“...virtually disposing the three-dimensional map in parallel to the map image at a backward position thereof seeing from a predetermined viewpoint, such that straight lines extending from the predetermined viewpoint to given points on a peripheral edge of the map image further pass through corresponding points on a peripheral edge of the three-dimensional map;

projecting the predetermined viewpoint onto the three-dimensional map via a position of the cursor displayed on the map image; and

detecting a point on the three-dimensional map where the projected viewpoint intersects the predetermined three-dimensional field, whereby determining the detected point as a position where the cursor specifies on the displayed map image...”

The prior art references cited by the Examiner, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, disclose, suggest or render obvious the claimed subject matter as set forth above.

Griffin et al. discloses a method for predicting, by means of line-of sight sampling ray, which segments of the database could be visible after a predetermined time interval, retrieving the predicted segments from a slow speed secondary memory and storing the retrieved segments

in a high-speed main memory, reading selected ones of the stored segments from the main memory and displaying the selected ones based on the actual vehicle path and position after the predetermined time interval has elapsed. Itai et al. discloses moving a cursor to indicate a character (object) on the basis of data on the coordinates of the character (object) when the character (object) is displayed on the display.

Thus, the sum total teaching of the references taken alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest the virtual disposition, the projecting, and the protecting as specifically required in independent claim 1 as set forth above in the quoted section therefrom. In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that independent claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record and an early indication of same is respectfully requested.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

It is submitted that the claims as amended herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

Toshihisa Satake

By

Gregory P. LaPointe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 28,395  
Tel: (203) 777-6628  
Fax: (203) 865-0297

Date: October 31, 2003

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on October 31, 2003.

  
Rachel Piscitelli